REMARKS

This paper is responsive to an Office Action mailed January 9, 2008. Prior to this response, claims 1-50 were pending. After amending claims 1, 6-7, 9, 15, 20-21, 23, 25-26, 31-32, 34, 37, 40, 45-46, and 48, and canceling claims 2-5, 16-19, 27-30, and 41-44, claims 1, 6-15, 20-26, 31-40, and 45-50 remain pending.

In Section 2 of the Office Action, objections are made to the drawings. In response, Replacement drawings are being filed concurrently with this response. The Replacement Sheet for Fig. 4 now includes reference designators "312" and "314".

In Sections 3 and 4 of the Office Action, objections are made to the term "Uniform Resource Indicator (URI)". In response, the Applicant notes that there is no uniform definition for the term URI. "URI" is defined by artisans in the field as Uniform Resource Indicator, Uniform Resource Identifier, Universal Resource Indicator, and Universal Resource Identifier. Attached as Appendix A is a source that refers to URI as "Uniform Resource Indicator". Since there is no standard definition for the term URI, and since a person of skill in the art would recognize the correspondence between the terms URI and Uniform Resource Indicator, the Applicant respectfully suggests that the specification language be left unamended.

In Section 5 of the Office Action objections are made to claims 1, 3-6, 9, 11, 15, 17-19, 23-29, 34-36, 38-40, 42-43, and 48-49 because of undefined abbreviations. In response, independent claims 1, 15, 26, and 40 have been amended to refine the first recitation of "MPEG-4" as

Moving Picture Experts Group 4, and the first recitation of "MPEG-2" as Moving Picture Experts Group 2. The Applicant notes that the first mention "TS" is already defined as Transport Stream.

Section 6 of the Office Action objects to claims 1, 15, 26, and 40 because of the term "indicator". As noted above in response to Sections 3 and 4 of the Office Action, the Applicant submits that the term "indicator" is not incorrect, and would be recognized by one with skill in the art.

In Section 8 of the Office Action claims 1-2, 5-11, 13-16, 19-27, 30-33, 35-36, 39-41, and 44-49 have been provisionally rejected on the grounds of nonstatutory type double patenting with respect to claims 1-6, 9-11, 13, 12 15-20, 23-25, 27-32, 36-38, 41-46, and 49-50 of co-pending Serial No.: 10/680,694. In response, a Terminal Disclaimer is being submitted concurrently with this response, disclaiming any term in the instant application extending beyond the expiration date of the co-pending application.

In Section 10 of the Office Action claims 1-3, 9-11, 14, 26-28, and 34-35 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as unpatentable with respect to Admitted Prior Art (APA) in view of Herpel, "Elementary Stream Management in MPEG-4, IEEE, March 1999 ("Herpel"). With respect to claims 1 and 25, the Office Action acknowledges that the APA fails to disclose retrieving MPEG-4 resources in response to accessing an address, or decoding the MPEG-4 resources. The Office Action states that Herpel discloses these features, and it would have been obvious to include the features of Herpel with the APA as a way to develop transport

encapsulated MPEG-4 streams in MPEG-2 TSs in real-time digital broadcasting. This rejection is traversed as follows.

The APA presents details of conventional MPEG-4 and MPEG-2 protocols.

Beginning on page 319, Herpel discloses a system decoder model (SDM), which is used to specify the behavior of a receiving MPEG-4 terminal. In Section IV C (page 321) Herpel states that MPEG-2 TSs may be used to encapsulate MPEG-4 streams. Three approaches are presented on page 322 for encapsulating MPEG-4 streams in an MPEG-2 TS, they are: 1) Single Stream Encapsulation; 2) FlexMux Stream Encapsulation; and, 3) Digital Storage Media.

In Section II-A, Herpel discloses OD components. As clearly stated by Herpel in the first paragraph under Section II (page 315, column 2), Herpel is describing an MPEG-4 system. This description is similar to the Applicant's explanation of Fig. 1. Herpel's description does not discuss the use of OD components in an MPEG-2 TS, or a lid component in an MPEG-2 TS.

Claim 1 has been amended to include the subject matter of claims 2-5 (now canceled). Claim 15 has been amended to include the subject matter of claims 16-19 (now canceled). Claim 26 has been amended to include the subject matter of claims 27-30 (now canceled). Claim 40 has been amended to include the subject matter of claims 41-44 (now canceled).

Generally, neither the APA nor Herpel disclose a process of accessing an address to retrieve MPEG-4 resources. Alternately stated,

the APA discloses no means of recovering MPEG-4 resources from an MPEG-2 TS. Herpel discloses 3 approaches to encapsulating MPEG-4 streams from an MPEG-2 TS, but no means of recovering MPEG-4 data in an MPEG-2 TS using a lid URI. More explicitly, neither the APA nor Herpel describe embedding MPEG-4 resources in an MPEG-2 stream using an OC transport protocol. Further, neither the APA not Herpel disclose using lid URIs to provide a binding name and access scheme to the objects in the OC.

An invention is unpatentable if the differences between it and the prior art would have been obvious at the time of the invention. As stated in MPEP § 2143, the *KSR International Co. v Teleflex Inc.* decision (82 USPQ2d 1385, 1395-1397, 2007) suggests 7 exemplary rationales to support a conclusion of obviousness, which include:

A) Combining prior art elements according to known methods to yield predictable results;

B) Simple substitution of one known element for another to obtain predictable results;

C) Use of known technique to improve similar devices (methods, or products) in the same way;

D) Applying a known technique to a known device (method, or product) ready for improvement to yield predictable results;

E) "Obvious to try" – choosing from a finite number of identified, predictable solutions, with a reasonable expectation of success;

F) Known work in one field of endeavor may prompt variations of it for use in either the same field or a different one based on

design incentives or other market forces if the variations are predictable to one of ordinary skill in the art;

G) Some teaching, suggestion, or motivation in prior art would have lead one of ordinary skill to modify the prior art reference or the combine prior art references teachings to arrive at the claimed invention.

The Office Action states that modifications to the APA would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art in light of Herpel. This rejection appears to be most closely grounded in the G) rationale - Some teaching, suggestion, or motivation in prior art would have lead one of ordinary skill to modify the prior art reference or the combine prior art references teachings to arrive at the claimed invention.

With respect to this rationale, MPEP 2143 (G) states that the rejection must articulate the following criteria to resolve the *Graham* factual analysis:

(1) a finding that there was some teaching, suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or combine reference teachings;

(2) a finding that there was a reasonable expectation of success; and

(3) whatever additional findings based on the Graham factual inquiries may be necessary, in view of the facts of the case under consideration, to explain a conclusion of obviousness.

With respect to the above-referenced first factual analysis criteria, the Herpel reference has been combined with the APA based

upon the assumption that the combination discloses all the limitations recited in Applicant's claims 1 and 26. However, even if it would have been obvious incorporate Herpel's methodologies into the APA, that combination still fails to describe embedding MPEG-4 resources in an MPEG-2 stream using an OC transport protocol, or using lid URIs to provide a binding name and access scheme to the objects in the OC, as recited in claims 1 and 26. Claims 9-11, and 14, dependent from claim 1, and claims 34-35, dependent from claim 26, enjoy the same distinctions.

The Office Action states that it would have been obvious to apply the features of Herpel to the APA as a way to develop transport encapsulated MPEG-4 streams in MPEG-2 TSs in real-time digital broadcasting. However, the desire for developing real-time broadcasting does not suggest an actual means of accomplishing this task. More explicitly, this motivation does not suggest the use of an OC transport protocol or the use of lid URIs to provide a binding name and access scheme to the objects in the OC. A *prima facie* analysis of motivation is especially critical in the present circumstances since the rejection is predicated on limitations that are not explicitly disclosed in the prior art references. The claimed invention can only be obvious if an artisan makes substantial modifications to the APA. However, there is nothing in the Herpel reference that suggests a modification based upon the use of an OC transport protocol or lid URIs, since Herpel's methods disclose none of these features.

Neither does the obviousness rejection provide evidence that such a modification would have been obvious to one with skill in the art based upon what was well known at the time of the invention. "(A)nalysis

[of whether the subject matter of a claim would have been obvious] need not seek out precise teachings directed to the specific subject matter of the challenged claim, for a court can take account of the inferences and creative steps that a person of ordinary skill in the art would employ." *KSR Int'l Co. v. Teleflex, Inc.*, 127 S. Ct. 1727, 1740-41, 82 USPQ2d 1385, 1396 (2007). However, if the *prima facie* rejection is supported by what was known by a person of ordinary skill in the art then additional evidence should have been provided. Notable, when the source or motivation is not from the prior art references, "the evidence" of motive will likely consist of an explanation or a well-known principle or problem-solving strategy to be applied". *DyStar*, 464 F.3d at 1366, 80 USPQ2d at 1649. The Office Action does not supply evidence that it was well known at the time of the invention to embed MPEG-4 resources in an MPEG-2 stream using an OC transport protocol, or to use lid URIs to provide a binding name and access scheme to the objects in the OC.

With respect to the second analysis criteria needed to support the G) obviousness rationale, even if an artisan were given the APA and Herpel references as a foundation, no evidence has been provided to show that there is a reasonable expectation of success in the claimed invention. That is, there can be no reasonable expectation of success if the references, and what was known by artisan at the time of the invention, do not teach all the limitations of the claimed invention.

In summary, the Applicant respectfully submits that a *prima facie* case of obvious has not been supported since the combination of the APA and Herpel does not explicitly disclose every limitation of claims 1

and 26. Neither has a case been supported that the APA can be modified to supply the missing limitations in view of Herpel, or what was well known by a person of skill at the time of the invention. Therefore, the Applicant requests that the rejection of claims 1, 9-11, 14, 26, and 34-35 be removed.

In Section 11 of the Office Action claims 4-8, 12-13, 29-31, and 37-38 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as unpatentable with respect to the APA and Herpel, and further in view of Waki et al. ("Waki"). The Office Action acknowledges that the APA and Herpel fail to disclose the use of an Object Carousal (OC), but that Waki discloses such a feature, and that it would have been obvious to incorporate the teaching of Waki into the APA and Herpel in order to receive files having an OC directory structure. This rejection is traversed as follows.

In paragraphs [0031-0042] Waki describes a conventional reception apparatus for receiving files having an OC method directory structure. A key information selection unit 158 selects directory names and file names (keys) according to the name of the reference name that the key list buffer 159 stores, and outputs the selected directory names and files names to the identifier indirect obtaining unit 157 [0035]. The identifier indirect unit 157 selects an identifier IOR related to the key output by the key information selection unit 158, and outputs the identifier IOR to the indirect directory message block selection unit 155 and data block selection unit 154 [0036]. The indirect directory message block selection unit 156 selects the directory object corresponding to the identifier IOR, and outputs the directory object to the directory message body obtaining unit [0037]. Waki makes no mention of organizing MPEP-

4 resources in an MPEG-2 TS using an OC transport protocol. Further, Waki makes no mention if using lid URIs to provide a binding name and access scheme to the objects in his directory.

The obviousness rejection is based upon the assumption that the APA and Herpel disclose all the limitations of amended claims 1 and 26. However, as noted in response to Section 10 of the Office Action, the combination of the APA and Herpel fails to disclose embedding MPEG-4 resources in an MPEG-2 stream using an OC transport protocol, and using lid URIs to provide a binding name and access scheme to the objects in the OC. Likewise, Waki fails to disclose these limitations. Therefore, even if Waki's OC system is combined with the APA and Herpel, the combination of three references still fails to explicitly describe embedding MPEG-4 resources in an MPEG-2 stream using an OC transport protocol, and using lid URIs to provide a binding name and access scheme to the objects in the OC, as recited in claims 1 and 26.

Neither does the motivation of merely receiving files in an OC system directory structure suggest modifications to the APA that would make obvious the above-cited claim limitations. For example, there is no suggestion in the Waki reference that lid URIs in an MPEG-2 TS can be used to access embedded MPEG-4 resources in an OC directory using a binding name and access scheme. Since the combination of references neither explicitly discloses all the claim limitations, nor suggests modification to the APA that would make all the limitations obvious, the Applicant requests that the rejection of claims 5-8, 12-13, 31, and 37-38 be withdrawn.

In Section 12 of the Office Action claim 39 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as unpatentable with respect to the APA and Herpel, and further in view of Yokomizo (US 2002/0124263). The Office Action acknowledges that the APA and Herpel fail to disclose a transmitter interface, but that Yokomizo discloses such a feature, and that it would have been obvious to incorporate the teaching of Yokomizo into the APA and Herpel in order to develop a carriage means at an input source and a decoding means. This rejection is traversed as follows.

The obviousness rejection is based upon the assumption that the APA and Herpel disclose all the limitations of claim 26. However, as noted in response to Section 10 of the Office Action, the combination fails to explicitly describe embedding MPEG-4 resources in an MPEG-2 stream using an OC transport protocol, and using lid URIs to provide a binding name and access scheme to the objects in the OC. Even if Yokomizo's transmitter is combined with the APA and Herpel, the combination of three references still fails to explicitly describe the above-mentioned claim limitations recited in claim 26.

Neither does the motivation of developing an input source and decoding means suggest modifications to the APA that would make obvious the recited lid URI system for binding name and access scheme to the MPEG-4 resources organized in an OC transport protocol. Since the combination of references neither explicitly discloses all the claim limitations, nor suggests modification to the APA that would make all the limitations obvious, the Applicant requests that the rejection of claim 39 be withdrawn.

In Section 13 of the Office Action claims 15, 24, and 25 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as unpatentable with respect to the APA in view of Yokomizo. The Office Action acknowledges that the APA fails to disclose a transmitter interface, but that Yokomizo discloses such a feature, and that it would have been obvious to incorporate the teaching of Yokomizo into the APA in order to develop a means for broadcasting MPEP-4 streams in an MPEG-2 TS. This rejection is traversed as follows.

Yokomizo discloses a system that transmits MPEP-2 data with a BIFS object, which appears as a button on a viewer's screen. The button is linked to a URL. When the viewer "pushes" the button, a connection is made by HTTP protocol to the viewer's set top box, and a synch layer is set for an MPEG-4 stream transmission [0030-0034]. Yokomizo does not disclose embedding MPEG-4 resources in an MPEG-2 stream using an OC transport protocol, or using lid URIs to provide a binding name and access scheme to the objects in the OC.

The obviousness rejection is based upon the assumption that the APA and Yokomizo disclose all the limitations of claim 15. However, neither the APA nor Yokomizo disclose embedding MPEG-4 resources in an MPEG-2 stream using an OC transport protocol, or using lid URIs to provide a binding name and access scheme to the objects in the OC. Therefore, the combination of references fails to explicitly describe every limitation of claim 15.

Neither does the motivation of broadcasting MPEP-4 streams in an MPEP-2 TS suggest a particular means of accomplishing such a task. In fact, the use of an HTTP protocol URL by Yokomizo points away from the Applicant's use of a lid URI. Since the combination of references neither explicitly discloses all the claim limitations, nor suggests

modification to the APA that would make all the limitations obvious, the Applicant requests that the rejection of claims 15 and 24-25 be withdrawn.

In Section 14 of the Office Action claims 16-17 and 23 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as unpatentable with respect to the APA and Yokomizo, in view of Herpel. The Office Action acknowledges that the APA and Yokomizo fail to disclose a URI that is local cache address, Web protocol identifier, or lid, but that Herpel discloses these features, and that it would have been obvious to incorporate the teaching of Herpel into the APA and Yokomizo. This rejection is traversed as follows.

In Section II-A, Herpel discloses OD components. As clearly stated by Herpel in the first paragraph under Section II (page 315, column 2), Herpel is describing an MPEG-4 system. This description is similar to the Applicant's explanation of Fig. 1. Herpel's description does not discuss the use of OD components in an MPEG-2 TS, or a lid component in an MPEG-2 TS. Although Herpel presents a relationship between an ES_Descriptor and a URL in the context of MPEP-4, he fails to suggest the use of a lid URI embedded in an MPEG-2 TS to access MPEG-4 resources. That is, the fact that Herpel suggests 3 different mechanisms for the carriage of MPEG-4 in an MPEG-2 TS that do not include the use of a pointer to a lid URI, is evidence that the claimed invention is unexpected, and that Herpel's solutions point away from the claimed invention. Since Herpel does not disclose to use of a lid URI to access MPEG-4 resources in an MPEG-2 TS, he cannot describe using lid URIs to provide a binding name and access scheme to the objects in an OC.

Therefore, even if Herpel is combined with the APA and Yokomizo, the combination does not disclose all the limitations of claim 15. The combination fails to explicitly describe embedding MPEG-4 resources in an MPEG-2 stream using an OC transport protocol, and using lid URIs to provide a binding name and access scheme to the objects in the OC.

Neither does the motivation of accessing MPEG-4 streams in an MPEG-2 TS suggest practical modifications to the APA that would make obvious the recited lid URI location system. None of the references suggest that a lid URI can be embedded in an MPEG-2 TS, MPEG-4 resources embedded in an MPEG-2 stream using an OC transport protocol, or lid URIs used to provide a binding name and access scheme to the objects in the OC. Since the combination of references neither explicitly discloses all the claim limitations, nor suggests modification to the APA that would make all the limitations obvious, the Applicant requests that the rejection of claim 23 be withdrawn.

In Section 15 of the Office Action claims 18-22 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as unpatentable with respect to the APA and Yokomizo, in view of Waki. The Office Action acknowledges that the APA and Yokomizo fail to disclose OC transport protocol, but that Waki discloses this feature, and that it would have been obvious to incorporate the teaching of Waki into the APA and Yokomizo to receive filed in the OC system directory structure. This rejection is traversed as follows.

The obviousness rejection is based upon the assumption that the APA and Yokomizo disclose all the limitations of claim 15. However, as noted in response to Section 13 of the Office Action, the combination

fails to explicitly describe embedding MPEG-4 resources in an MPEG-2 stream using an OC transport protocol, and using lid URIs to provide a binding name and access scheme to the objects in the OC. Even if Waki's OC organized directory is combined with the APA and Yokomizo, the combination of three references still fails to explicitly describe all the limitations of claim 15.

Neither does the motivation of receiving files in an OC system directory structure suggest modifications to the APA that would make obvious the recited URI location system. Since the combination of references neither explicitly discloses all the claim limitations, nor suggests modification to the APA that would make all the limitations obvious, the Applicant requests that the rejection of claims 20-22 be withdrawn.

In Section 17 of the Office Action claims 40-41 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by Yokomizo. This rejection is traversed as follows. As noted in response to Section 13 of the Office Action, Yokomizo fails to disclose embedding MPEG-4 resources in an MPEG-2 stream using an OC transport protocol, or using lid URIs to provide a binding name and access scheme to the objects in the OC.

"A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference." *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987).

Yokomizo does not explicitly disclose every limitation of claim 40. As a result, claim 40 is not anticipated, and the Applicant requests that the rejection be removed.

In Section 19 of the Office Action claims 42 and 48-50 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as unpatentable with respect to Yokomizo in view of Ito et al. ("Ito"; US 6,377,309). The Office Action acknowledges that Yokomizo fails to disclose an interface to accept MPEG-4 information, but that Ito discloses this feature, and that it would have been obvious to combine references to provide a method of reproducing digital TV data from a digital TV broadcast. This rejection is traversed as follows.

The obviousness rejection is based upon the assumption that the Yokomizo discloses all the limitations of claim 40. However, as noted in response to Section 13 of the Office Action, Yokomizo fails to explicitly describe embedding MPEG-4 resources in an MPEG-2 stream using an OC transport protocol, and using lid URIs to provide a binding name and access scheme to the objects in the OC. Even if Ito's interface is combined with the Yokomizo, the combination of references still fails to explicitly describe all the limitations of claim 40.

Neither does the motivation of reproducing digital TV data suggest modifications to the Yokomizo that would make obvious embedded MPEG-4 resources organized in an OC transport protocol, or the use of lid URIs to provide a binding name and access scheme to the objects in the OC. Since the combination of references neither explicitly discloses all the claim limitations, nor suggests modification to the Yokomizo that would make all the limitations obvious, the Applicant requests that the rejection of claims 48-50 be withdrawn.

In Section 20 of the Office Action claims 43-47 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as unpatentable with respect to Yokomizo in view Waki. The Office Action acknowledges that Yokomizo fails to disclose an OC system, but that Waki discloses this feature, and that it would have been obvious to combine references to provide a method of transmitting files in an OC directory structure. This rejection is traversed as follows.

The obviousness rejection is based upon the assumption that the Yokomizo discloses all the limitations of claim 40. However, as noted in response to Section 13 of the Office Action, Yokomizo fails to explicitly describe embedding MPEG-4 resources in an MPEG-2 stream using an OC transport protocol, and using lid URIs to provide a binding name and access scheme to the objects in the OC. Even if Waki's OC method directory is combined with the Yokomizo, the combination of references still fails to explicitly describe all the limitations of claim 40.

Neither does the motivation of transmitting files in an OC directory structure suggest modifications to the Yokomizo that would make obvious embedded MPEG-4 resources organized in an OC transport protocol, or the use of lid URIs to provide a binding name and access scheme to the objects in the OC. Since the combination of references neither explicitly discloses all the claim limitations, nor suggests modification to the Yokomizo that would make all the limitations obvious, the Applicant requests that the rejection of claims 45-47 be withdrawn.

It is believed that the application is in condition for allowance and reconsideration is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 4/7/2008

Gerald Maliszewski
Registration No. 38,054

Customer Number 55,286
P.O. Box 270829
San Diego, CA 92198-2829
Telephone: (858) 451-9950
Facsimile: (858) 451-9869
gerry@ipatentit.net

APPENDIX A

NCBI Book DTD and NCBI Collection DTD Tag Library version 2.3
Digital Archive of Journal Articles
National Center for Biotechnology Information (NCBI)
National Library of Medicine (NLM)

Element: <uri>

Uniform Resource Indicator (URI)

Definition

Identifies a Uniform Resource Indicator (such as a URL) that may be used as a live link, typically naming a website, such as <url>http://www.mulberrytech.com</url>

Remarks

This element identifies a URI, but can be used in two ways. For example, a URL may be the content of the element (as was just shown) or, alternatively, the content may name the URL, for example:

```
<uri>Mulberry's Website</uri>
```

and the xlink:href attribute may hold the real URL as is shown here:

```
<uri xlink:href="http://www.mulberrytech.com">Mulberry's Website</uri>
```

Attributes

content-type **Type of Content**

xlink:actuate **Actuating the Link**

xlink:href **Href (Linking Mechanism)**

xlink:role **Role of the Link**

xlink:show **Showing the Link**

xlink:title **Title of the Link**

xlink:type **Type of Link**

xmlns:xlink **XLink Namespace Declaration**

Related Elements

The <self-uri> element is used when a document is available in multiple forms, for example, as a means of indicating the online version of a print book. Conversely, a URI that indicates a different book or any other kind of external reference is usually tagged with the <ext-link> element. The element <uri>, although allowed everywhere <ext-link> is used, is more typically part of an address, information concerning a contributor, or part of a reference citation. Loosely put, an external link <ext-link> is intended to act as a link; a URI <uri> makes no promises but identifies a URI, such as a URL, when it is present in the text of an address or a citation; and <self-uri> points to another form of the same document.

The elements used in an address include the address class elements: <addr-line>, <country>, <fax>, <institution>, and <phone> and the address linking class elements: <email>, <ext-link>, <multi-link>, and <uri>.

Model Information

Content Model

```
<!ELEMENT  uri          (#PCDATA %uri-elements;)*                    >
```

Description

Any combination of:

- Text, numbers, or special characters
- All the emphasis elements:
  - **Bold** <bold>
  - **Italic** <italic>
  - **Monospace Text (Typewriter Text)** <monospace>
  - **Named Special (Subject) Content** <named-content>
  - **Overline** <overline>
  - **Overline Start** <overline-start>
  - **Overline End** <overline-end>
  - **Sans Serif** <sans-serif>
  - **Small Caps** <sc>
  - **Strike Through** <strike>
  - **Underline** <underline>
  - **Underline Start** <underline-start>
  - **Underline End** <underline-end>
- **Subscript** <sub>
- **Superscript** <sup>

This element may be contained in:

<address> **Address/Contact Information**; <aff> **Affiliation**; <alt-title> **Alternate Title**; <array> **Array (Simple Tabular Array)**; <article-title> **Article Title**; <attrib> **Attribution**; <bold> **Bold**; <book-meta> **Book Metadata**; <book-part-meta> **Book Part Metadata**; <book-title> **Book Title**; <chem-struct> **Chemical Structure (Display)**; <chem-struct-wrapper> **Chemical Structure Wrapper**; <citation> **Citation**; <collab> **Collaborative (Group) Author**; <collection-name> **Collection Name**; <comment> **Comment in a Citation**; <contrib> **Contributor**; <contrib-group> **Contributor Group**; <copyright-statement> **Copyright Statement**; <corresp> **Correspondence Information**; <def-head> **Definition List: Definition Head**; <disp-formula> **Formula, Display**; <fig> **Figure**; <fig-group> **Figure Group**; <graphic> **Graphic**; <inline-supplementary-material> **Inline Supplementary Material**; <italic> **Italic**; <media> **Media Object**; <meta-name> **Metadata Data Name for Custom Metadata**; <meta-value> **Metadata Data Value for Custom Metadata**; <monospace> **Monospace Text (Typewriter Text)**; <named-content> **Named Special (Subject) Content**; <overline> **Overline**; <p> **Paragraph**; <preformat> **Preformatted Text**; <publisher-loc> **Publisher's Location**; <related-article> **Related Article Information**; <related-object> **Related Object Information**; <sans-serif> **Sans Serif**; <sc> **Small Caps**; <source> **Source**; <strike> **Strike Through**; <sub> **Subscript**; <subtitle> **Subtitle**; <sup> **Superscript**; <supplementary-material> **Supplementary Material**; <table-wrap> **Table Wrapper**; <table-wrap-group> **Table Wrapper Group**; <td> **Table Data Cell (XHTML table model)**; <term> **Definition List: Term**; <term-head> **Definition List: Term Head**; <th> **Table Header Cell (XHTML table model)**; <title> **Title**; <trans-source> **Translated Source**; <trans-subtitle> **Translated Subtitle**; <trans-title> **Translated Title**; <underline> **Underline**

Tagged Example

```
...
<contrib contrib-type="author" rid="IIDR">
<name><surname>Taylor</surname>
<given-names>James C.</given-names>
</name>
<degrees>PhD</degrees>
<aff id="IIDR">
<institution>Institute of Infectious Disease Research
</institution><break/>
<addr-line>Oberlin, MD 20869</addr-line>
</aff>
<address>
<institution>Kalakukko Corporation</institution>
<addr-line>17 West Jefferson St.</addr-line>
<addr-line>Suite 207</addr-line>
<addr-line>New South Finland, MD 20856</addr-line>
<country>USA</country>
<phone>(301) 754-5766</phone>
<fax>(301) 754-5765</fax>
<email>jct@kalakukko.com</email>
<uri>http://www.kalakukko.com</uri>
</address>
```

```
</contrib>
...
```

Module

`common.ent`

NCBI Book DTD and NCBI Collection DTD Tag Library version 2.3
Version of March 2007